UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,154	05/25/2007	Toshinori Watanabe	71, 051-034	8842
	7590 10/20/200 IOWARD ATTORNE	EXAMINER		
450 West Fourt	·	BERMAN, SUSAN W		
Royal Oak, MI 48067			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/582,154	WATANABE ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	/Susan W. Berman/	1796		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Ju</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6 and 8-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4,7 and 11-14 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the construction of the correction and the correction are constructed to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object to be a second constant.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) \(\int \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

Response to Amendment

The rejection of claims 1-10 as being anticipated by Ghoshal et al (6,832,036, filed 10-11-2002) is withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 11 as being unpatentable over Ghoshal et al, as applied to claim 1 above, is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see the Remarks filed 07-06-2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) over Ghoshal et al '035 have been fully considered in view of the amended claims and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Kessel et al (5,217.805) or Kohno et al (7,534,820).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With respect to claim s8, there is no antecedent basis in claim 6 for the recitation "said optical waveguide" in claim 8. Claim 6 recites a "light-transmitting component".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohno et al (7,534,820). Kohno et al disclose compositions of a cationic photoinitiator and a polyorganosiloxane of formula (1) in column 2, wherein x is an epoxy functional group and R can be an alkyl or aryl group. Specific polysiloxane formulas (2) and (3) are also taught in columns 2-3. The synthesis examples disclose hydrosilyl and epoxy group-containing polysiloxanes. The difference from the instantly claimed composition is that Kohno et al do not teach the specific mol percent limitations of phenyl and epoxy groups set forth in the instant claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 7, 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With respect to claims 4 and 7, the prior art cited herein and otherwise known to the Examiner does not teach optical waveguides from the epoxy-functional organopolysiloxanes of the instantly claimed formula. With respect to claims 13 and 14, the prior art cited herein and otherwise known to the Examiner does not disclosed the specific organopolysiloxane structure set forth in instant claims 13-14.

Conclusion

Page 4

The following references are cited as art of interest.

Bahadur et al (US 2008/0260337, having an effective filing date of 08-16-2007) disclose epoxy-functional polysiloxanes and compositions thereof.

McLaughlin et al (US 2006/0199081) disclose an optical reading method and a dimensionally stable film comprising a binder material, curable photoactive material and photoinitiator. The photoactive materials include organopolysiloxanes containing monovalent aliphatic, aromatic and epoxy functional groups, as disclosed in paragraphs [0033] to [0035].

Kobayashi et al (5,198,476) disclose epoxy-functional polyorganosiloxanes as described in column 3, lines 55-63, in compositions with organopolysiloxanes having alkenyl units instead of epoxy units. Although the R groups are defined as monovalent hydrocarbon groups, the specifically disclosed epoxy-modified silicone oils (I), (II0, and (III) in the synthesis examples do not contain phenyl groups.

Eckberg et al (5,360,833) disclose compositions comprising an epoxy-functional silicone resin comprised of Q, M, D and T silicone units.

Kessel et al (5,217.805) disclose UV curable compositions comprising a polyepoxypolysiloxane. Formula I discloses a polysiloxane having lower alkyl substituents "R", hydrocarbyl, including phenyl, substituents "R\" and epoxy groups "E". Kessel et al do not teach hydroxy or alkoxy substituents. The preferred epoxypolysiloxanes are free of cycloaliphatic substituents (column 4, line 65, to column 5, line 7). Photoinitiators are taught in column 6. Solvents are discussed in column 7. The difference from the instantly claimed composition is

Application/Control Number: 10/582,154 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

that Kessel et al do not teach RSiO_{3/2} siloxane units or the specific mol percent limitations of phenyl and epoxy groups set forth in the instant claims. The additional components of the compositions disclosed by Kessel et al are encompassed by the comprising language of the instant claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Susan W. Berman/ whose telephone number is 571 272 1067. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571 272 1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SB 10/19/2009 /Susan W Berman/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796